

So the Senator from Indiana should recognize that, as we assume almost the entire responsibility not only in South Korea, but everywhere else, we have assurances from the Assistant Secretary of State that our great allies in the United Nations have a handful of forces, or token military personnel, in South Korea.

Mr. JENNER. We had assurances that the Chinese were "agrarian reformers," but I question some of those assurances.

Let me continue with the explanation. Every policy decision is, therefore, subordinated to Security Council policies.

We can make only such military moves, in the last analysis, as have the approval of the Soviet Union.

If we spent all the wealth of the United States on military aid to the free nations of Asia, we could not give one iota of help to true freedom, because we must tell our allies they may use the money for marching soldiers, but they must never let their soldiers go near the enemy.

Free Chinese fighting men must stand and watch the enemy assemble mountainous supplies of tanks and planes and ships, for an offensive attack on their homeland, but never make a move to break up the invasion.

We remember how someone in the State Department would not let our forces cross the Yalu in Korea, to bomb enemy airbases, though the refusal cost us many precious lives.

Sometimes, I call this policy of giving our Asian allies military playthings, but not permitting them to use our help for any military purpose, the policy of the hickory limb.

All of us remember the old verse:

Mother may I go out to swim?

Yes, my darling daughter,

Hang your clothes on a hickory limb

But don't go near the water.

Perhaps some Senators noticed the interesting item in the hearings that our Government wishes to set up a GI bill of rights, with medical care and other benefits, for free Chinese soldiers too old to fight.

Yes, yes, that is our policy to defend America.

Let us spend American money freely for all the soldiers of the world who are too old to fight, but nothing for landing ships for the free Chinese to reach the mainland, and prove how widespread is the popular resistance to Red China.

Let us ask ourselves this question: What would happen to a Soviet official who proposed keeping the Communist satellite armies on a leash, while Soviet wealth was gaily handed out to allied soldiers too old to fight?

Our so-called mutual security program wraps our military defense in Western Europe in a pretty bundle called NATO which makes a fine military display at SHAPE, but is in fact a supranational agency with political and economic, as well as military, powers and governing machinery.

NATO's military strength rests on nations with powerful fifth columns which are constantly eroding their nation's sovereignty, and slanting their policies, to help the Soviet Union, as the Com-

munist fifth column undermined France before Hitler.

NATO's real aims are hidden in the stratosphere, but the guiding influences in NATO are not able, or willing, to effect the rearming of Germany.

The Geneva conferences apparently fitted NATO into precisely detailed plans for the coming mutual-security alliances with the Soviet Union, which will be publicized, after the Communist empire has dutifully carried out certain rituals to prove how peace loving it is.

Where is the defense for America in that hidden agreement?

Our so-called mutual-security programs wrap up another pretty bundle—the giving of billions to those nations which will not join free Asia in readiness to fight for freedom.

This serves the double purpose of telling the Asians that we admire neutralism, and telling the brave Asian fighters for freedom that they would have been better off if they had been neutralist.

The rash of conflicting statements on neutralism put out by our foreign-policy planners has cost us more, than a generation of foreign-aid spending could repair.

The Pakistan Prime Minister was educated in an American college in Pakistan.

His Government well understands the threat from Soviet diplomacy.

But his people, though firmly anti-Communist, urge him to accept the invitation to visit Moscow.

They say, "If you go to Moscow, the American State Department will send its officials running, to bring gifts to us."

Now we hear that foreign nations are deliberately setting out to get aid both from the Soviet Union and from the United States.

They will not only be able to send the bids higher, but they figure that neither the Soviet Union nor America will dare withdraw the aid, if both are involved.

That is like the argument we heard about Yugoslavia and Tito. We were told that we could not stop aid, because we had a billion dollar investment there, and therefore must go on with aid to Tito.

And our foreign-policy planners tell us they are so clever only they can understand the intricacies of international relations, and Congress must dutifully accept whatever they put before us.

I will not waste your time with the foolish argument that we must keep up this foreign-aid spending, because communism stems from poverty, and we can easily overcome it by welfare.

Communism is a disease which attacks the ambitious, the overeducated, the bored, the idle rich.

Any Senator who does not believe it should read the records of our committees.

The strongest resistance to it comes from self-respecting workers in factories, farms, and other productive enterprises.

But there is more than waste of our people's earnings in this doctrine.

All nations are threatened with a fearful danger from the rapid population increase facing the world.

There has never been any repeal of Malthus' law that population, when it

starts to rise, grows by leaps and bounds in geometric ratio.

The danger used to be food supply.

Today, it is the supply of land.

The "population explosion" which accompanied the peace and prosperity of the last century caused plenty of national rivalry for "living space," and ended in two World Wars.

But the earlier population explosion spread out into the empty spaces of the Western Hemisphere.

The population explosion now facing us is taking place in Asia where people are already pitifully overcrowded on the land.

The possibilities are fearful to contemplate.

Every responsible statesman is deeply concerned.

Those who imagine this approaching crisis can be met by more sanitation and welfare are guilty of unpardonable frivolity.

The United States is too powerful in this sorely beset world of today to let itself be represented by stupidity, sentimental ignorance, or the doctrine of "after us the deluge."

The hatred and violence of communism will be helped, not hindered, by the crisis rapidly building up from the world's rapid population growth.

Still another bundle in the foreign-aid package includes these mysterious Presidential funds for use anywhere and anyhow.

One Presidential fund for \$100 million is available with no restraints whatever.

Moreover, the President's authority under section 401, to shift \$50 million of mutual security funds from one use to another, "without regard to the requirements of this act, or any other act for which funds are authorized by this act," was raised to \$150 million.

In addition to vast powers, exercised, of course, by subordinates, a statement by the President that he has expended these funds and that it "is inadvisable to specify the nature of such expenditures," is sufficient accounting for their use.

We know perfectly well, whatever the magazine writers may say, that President Eisenhower cannot make all the decisions on all the problems now assigned to him, personally, by Congress.

Decisions must be made almost entirely by his staff.

All devices for appropriating money to the President, instead of appropriating it to any agency whose powers and duties are fixed by Congress, are transfers of legislative power from elected representatives to unelected officials in the executive branch, who already have too many powers we cannot see.

The Members of the Senate and House who undertook to check on our foreign-aid spending have performed a great service for the other Members of Congress, and for the people for whom we act.

The evidence of their hard work can be found in the debates on this year's bills in the House and the Senate.

But all we know, Mr. President, that the Members of Congress can barely see the outer fringes of this crucially important activity of our Government.

A curtain of fog covers nearly everything the executive agencies are doing in this field.

The Senate hearings on the authorization bill alone runs to 1,083 pages.

Altogether, Senate and House hearings on both authorization and appropriation bills will total nearly 4,000 pages.

But how much information do we actually find?

Every time a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee came close to a really important issue of policy, before the Government witnesses replied, the words "off the record" were interposed.

The same is true of all the committee hearings.

This magic formula does not apply to military secrets alone. Not at all.

When Senators are told that other nations are paying a part of the cost of military budgets, and then they learn that the contributions of the other governments come from counterpart funds, that is, from the sale of American goods we gave to those governments, and they try to pursue the question, we see the magic word "deleted."

How fantastic it is that a Member of this body has had to travel around the world, year after year, to find out what is being done with the taxpayers' money.

Then he prepares a comprehensive speech and cannot deliver it, but Senators who have the time, may go to the Senate Appropriations Committee, and read a copy.

For years now, in connection with foreign aid bills, Members of Congress have worked long and hard, trying to improve this clause or that, to take out this or that useless provision.

I admire these Members for their devotion to their duty, but all we have in the end, by that method, is a thing of shreds and patches.

The Bible says one cannot grow figs from thistles.

It says that a house built upon sand cannot stand.

There has never been an example of the failure of that law.

There is only postponement of the collapse which makes death and devastation more widespread.

There is no possibility that we can make a sound foreign policy and military policy upon the present foundation, because the foundation is unsound.

We can repair the leaks and the cracks in the walls, but they will reappear next year and every year, because the foreign-aid program rests on ground which is sinking beneath our feet.

Our so-called mutual-security package includes, then:

First. A program for equipping the armed forces of free Asia, which is hog-tied by delicate lines of control leading through the provisions of the Mutual Security Act to the United Nations Security Council.

Second. A program for a supranational agency—NATO—which subsidizes the budgets of Western European countries which are none too eager either to stand up to Soviet Russia, or to let Germany do it.

Meanwhile, our own security is subject to the influence of their fifth col-

umnists, in the invisible meetings of the NATO Council, whose reports Congress is not permitted to see.

Third. A program for Socialist-neutralist countries which have never supported free Asia, satellite Europe, or the United States, at any crucial stage of the Communist advance.

Fourth. Mysterious entities called President's funds which are under no congressional limits or restrictions of any sort.

What aim or purpose they are to meet has never been seriously stated.

Fifth. A miscellany of grants to various international activities, mostly duplicating work our Government is also carrying on.

Where is the military security for the United States in that hodgepodge?

At various times I have pointed out on the Senate floor the astonishing, but almost unnoticed, change which has taken place since 1940 in that part of the executive branch dealing with foreign and military affairs.

There is no hope that Congress can shift our present fantastic spending programs to sound foreign and military policies, until we understand the far-reaching effect of this complete administrative transformation.

We in the Congress are making laws and granting appropriations to the historic State Department, which guided our foreign policy within the limits set by the Constitution and the statutes.

But we do not have that constitutional State Department any more.

We do not have the Military Establishment which we used to have, when the Cabinet department heads were the President's top advisers and administrative aides.

The State Department of Secretary Hull held firmly to the great tradition of our Secretaries of State, from the founding of our Republic.

This distinguished foreign policy establishment was transformed into something new and strange, when Harry Hopkins became the dominant influence on policymaking in wartime.

American foreign policy was shifted from diplomacy to spending with the Lend-Lease Act of April 1941, which enabled the administration to set up emergency agencies in the foreign field, modeled on the emergency welfare spending agencies of the thirties.

These included Foreign Operations Administration, OWI, OSS, and the rest. On and on they go.

"Oh," they say, "our military Chiefs of Staff have said so-and-so."

But let us see what they can say and how they can say it. They are hog-tied, under our foreign policy.

This new management group in foreign affairs promptly took over the direction of higher military policy.

By means of the combined boards, especially the combined Munitions Assignment Board, it was soon raised to international status, so that Congress could not subpoena its Chairman, Mr. Hopkins, and ask embarrassing questions.

I need only point out to you, Mr. President, that this strange new growth, out-

side and above our Constitution, was carried out—

First. Under the war powers.

Second. By administrators who had learned, in the relief and welfare agencies of the thirties, how to use emergency funds as grants of unlimited legislative power.

Third. By agency staffs in which active leadership was taken by Alger Hiss, Harry D. White, Owen Lattimore, Laughlin Currie, Frank Coe, Harold Glasser, Solomon Adler, and a long list of other people whose records have been brought out in sworn testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security and the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

These staff members in Government were, as you know, continuously advised by officials of the Institute for Pacific Relations, whose wartime activities have been reported in detail by the Senate subcommittee.

I need not tell you, Mr. President, that these men were engaged in something vastly more important than making individual jobs for themselves.

They were engaged in building an administrative network within our Government, but not under our Constitution, which could exercise, through spending, powers which Congress would never have granted them, and the Constitution would not have permitted.

This wild growth of governmental functions in the United States was never submitted to the people, submitted to the courts, or properly submitted to Congress with the information necessary for full congressional examination.

The policy of guiding international affairs through spending—instead of diplomacy—was continued during the 11 postwar years, under cover of a series of continuous emergencies.

Dean Acheson, who succeeded Mr. Hopkins as guide and manager of international power through the use of public money, worked out the Marshall plan and its successors, in order to continue emergency spending—which means spending not controlled by Congress.

Mr. Acheson also incorporated into the State Department most of the personnel of the emergency agencies working in foreign affairs, after dismissing Secretary Byrnes' security officer, Mr. J. Anthony Panuch, with 10 minutes' notice.

Foreign policymaking spread outward into new superagencies like the National Security Council, secret agencies like CIA, and a network of international agencies like U. N., NATO, GATT, and the rest, all of them well-insulated against the influence of Congress.

This complex of agencies, whose power derived from spending rather than from statutory organization and duties, defined by Congress, still firmly controls our military policy.

The role of our military men has been subtly changed from advising the American people on what measures are needed for national security to that of advising the foreign policymakers on how to achieve the ends they seek.

They have silently replaced national security with collective security under the United Nations.

But the United Nations is not anti-Communist.

It does not pretend to be.

It is a neutralist.

A military policy tied in to U. N. collective security must be a military policy acceptable to the Soviet Union and, therefore, to Red China.

This is where the right of our fleets to cross the Yalu was buried.

This is where our aid to the Nationalist Chinese forces has been held down to defensive equipment only.

This is where any move on our part to give effective military force to the free world will die of suffocation.

Our military strategy is under the complete dominion of foreign policy-planners who are committed to super-nationalism, to one-world-ism, to collaboration with the collectivist trends of the moment, and to appeasement of the Soviet Union.

I said, in discussing the Foreign Aid Bill of 1955, that our military policymaking is carried on by means of an administrative monstrosity.

I repeat, Mr. President, that Congress will never recapture its constitutional responsibility for foreign and military policy until it demolishes this administrative complex and reestablishes the historic State Department whose authority rests on its loyal adherence to American principles, and its use of the dignified method of diplomacy, instead of the vulgar method of foreign spending.

Congress will never reestablish its responsibility for making a policy to safeguard America, until it separates foreign policymaking from military policymaking, and makes them both responsible to the Congress and the American people.

Members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs discussed the possibility of separating military aid from economic aid.

Representative SELDEN, of Alabama, said:

Most of the witnesses failed to present any substantial reason for the procedure now being followed.

Secretary Dulles said such a change would be impossible.

Why?

Because the giving of large sums of money to other nations causes economic and social complications and, apparently, only the staff of the State Department is competent to deal with anything so complex.

The poor Defense Department and the Members of Congress would be hopelessly bogged down in efforts to understand international economic or social problems.

Obviously, the military policy of a nation must be in harmony with its foreign policy, but it is equally obvious that the military establishment cannot be dominated by the foreign policy establishment.

The military program must be designed to go into effect instantly if diplomatic measures fail, or a hostile nation will deliberately revert to methods of compulsion.

It is cardinal to any real security of the United States that our military establishment must not be tied to errors in foreign policy.

Its role is to compensate for possible errors in diplomatic policy.

To tie military policy and operations to the State Department, or to any other agency dominated by foreign policy planners, like the National Security Council or the CIA, is equivalent to fastening the braking mechanism of an automobile to the steering wheel, so that it can operate only as the steering wheel moves.

The forces operating on our governmental organization since 1940, which have made the military establishment a technical agency for carrying out policies laid down by the internationalists, must be removed from power over our national destiny.

Only Congress can remove them.

It is, I agree, a cardinal principle of our form of government that the military establishment is to operate under what has usually been called the civil power.

As I have pointed out at length, this phrase is misleading or perhaps deliberately twisted from its original meaning.

The historic meaning of the phrase is that, under a government of laws, the military establishment must likewise operate under the law.

In a country where citizens are sovereign, the major policy guidance of the military must come from those who are elected by the citizens to speak for them.

There is nothing whatever in this doctrine to justify the Hopkins-Acheson policy of putting the professional military staff under another group of non-elected professional officials.

The State Department, like the military, is responsible for taking its overall direction from elected officials.

The Constitution gives to Congress the sole authority to make the change from the methods of diplomacy to the methods of war, in our dealings with other nations.

The President and the executive branch have fullpower and responsibility for carrying out the policy selected, but the right to invoke war remains with Congress.

It is sheer nonsense to argue that the executive must have the war power because we learn faster about new wars by radio than we did by sailing vessel and horseback. That only means Congress must act faster.

Limited government and the rule of law require that the right to use the Nation's human strength and economic resources for war must rest with the Congress as the people's representatives.

The power to turn the Nation from the method of diplomacy to the method of war is the primary sovereign power.

The Constitution-makers gave that power to Congress alone, because they knew from bitter experience of many centuries that the power to make war can never be trusted to men in power, in any form of government.

The powers given to Congress in the Constitution can never be taken away

from us. They can only be cravenly surrendered.

Likewise, the duty to safeguard the Nation against threat by maintaining the Military Establishment in fighting trim is given to Congress through the power to raise and support armies.

The provision that no appropriation for the Armed Forces shall be for a longer term than 2 years is specifically designed to insure that each incoming Congress shall be able to reestablish its authority over the Armed Forces, in spite of the advantage held by an executive branch in continuous operation.

There is no slightest possibility that our country can give untrammelled military support to the truly anti-Communist countries, under any kind of appropriation, so long as we continue—by our inaction—the present administrative monstrosity which puts the Military Establishment under foreign policymakers who serve international interests, and not the security of the United States.

We cannot, by any appropriation, give encouragement to the people of the satellite countries, where unarmed men have twice in the last few years walked hand in hand, in to the fire of tanks, to fight for liberty.

We cannot, by any appropriation, help the countries on the see-saw of neutralism to get rid of the Soviet fifth column which is propagandizing their people to trust in peaceful coexistence.

We are, on the contrary, being rapidly booby-trapped into giving even more funds to the soft neutralist countries, in the vain hope that that will slow down the Communist advance.

Mr. President, let me tell you just one thing; this fantastic complex cannot stand still. It must, by its very nature, keep in constant motion.

While Congress is kept busy discussing the details of spending, where is our country drifting?

In the quiet that followed the end of the Korean shooting, we could not, at first, detect any movement on the international chessboard.

The Berlin Conference of February 1954, the mysterious campaign of Dien Bien Phu, and the Geneva Conference of 1954, where Chou En-lai helped partition Vietnam, while we stood by, were the first warning that the subtle plans to guide American policy to a super-national one world on a collectivist model were again being put into effect.

In 1955, the trend of appeasement reached the carefully planned climax of the meeting at the Summit, the Geneva Foreign Ministers Conference after the Summit meeting, and the meetings between an American ambassador and a Red Chinese of ambassadorial rank, while the fiction that we did not recognize Red China was carried on.

Austria accepted the Soviet demand that she give up her power to defend herself.

We saw the outlines of the new program of neutralization, by which a belt of defenseless states were to surround the Soviet satellites from Sweden, around the Mediterranean and the Near East to India, Indochina, and perhaps to Japan, all carved from the free world.